IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

SINGLE BENCH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1321 /2005

PETITIONER

Ashok Kumar Sharma, son of Shri Ghurau Prasad Sharma aged 24 (presently 47) years, Ad-hoc Assistant Teacher, Government Primary School – Leelapur, Tah. Lormi, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.), resident of Gondpara, Bilaspur (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. The State of Chhattisgarh, through : the Secretary, Department of Education, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (CG)

2. The Director, Lok Shikshan Sanchalnalay, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (CG)

3. The District Education Officer, Education Distt. Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)

4. The State of Madhya Pradesh through : the Secretary, Department of Education, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (Madhya Pradesh)

5. The Secretary, Department of General Administration, Mantralay, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (CG)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

XI-HC-22

21

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.1321/ **सन्** 2005

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	6-4-2005 Mr. Pritam Tiwari, counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Sandeep Dubey, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents. Heard both the counsel. The petitioner's case is that he was appointed as ad-hoc teacher in the year 1979 for a period of three months on a fixed salary of Rs.300/- per month and after completion of the tenure, the petitioner's services were discontinued. Thereafter, for the vacancy which arose on account of discontinuation of the services of the petitioner, appointment of other person was made on that post, and since then the petitioner is making regular representations, and the Government is not paying any heed to the request of the petitioner. In the year 1997, vide order dated 28-8-1997 (Annexure P-2), the erstwhile State of Madhya Pradesh issued a circular to all the Departments that the vacancies for the post of Teacher should be filled by appointment of ad-hoc teachers. But, the State Government is not considering the request of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to the respondents State and the Government may be directed to consider the same and decide after due consideration to which learned Govt. Advocate has no objection. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the opinion that it is a fit case in which the petitioner should be allowed to make a detailed representation raising all his grievances. Therefore, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent No.2 within a period of 15 days from today, and in turn, respondent No.2 is directed to consider the same and decide in an objective manner after considering all the points raised by the	

XI-HC-22

(21)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.1321 **सन्** 2005

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

petitioner within two months from the date of receipt of the representation, in accordance with law.

With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.

Consequently, M.(W.)P.No.1029/2005 and I.A.No.2503/2005 also stand disposed of.

Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
L.C.BHADOO
Judge